THE MIZAN NEWSLETTER

No. 9 September 1959

The Mizan Newsletter aims at giving an objective and balanced account of current Soviet writings on the Middle East

---

The first article in this issue is the first of three which will examine Soviet Views on Israel. Since 1948 the Soviet view of Israel has changed from sympathy to hostility. The article examines the grounds for this hostility, and the extent to which it is carried - whether, for example, the Arab view of Israel as an artificial and wrongful creation now finds any support in Soviet writing.

The XXVth International Congress of Orientalists - Leningrad 1960 gives such information on the Congress as has appeared in Soviet journals. It shows that two aspects of the Congress which are given prominence in the USSR are the participation of scholars from eastern countries and the sympathy of Soviet orientalists with "liberation movements" in the East; and it shows that Soviet scholars expect the Congress to demonstrate the superiority of the Marxist-Leninist principles on which Soviet oriental studies are based.

Soviet Angle on the News covers Soviet press reports and articles on the Iraqi Communist Party's recent confession of errors; anti-communism in the UAR and the Sudan; Soviet technical aid to Iraq and the UAR; and Persian-US relations.

SOVIET VIEWS ON ISRAEL (I): ISRAEL'S ESTABLISHMENT

The Soviet Union was the first country to accord de jure recognition to the newly proclaimed State of Israel in May 1948. Soviet writings at that time dwelt on Soviet support for Israel's independence, and contrasted this with alleged US collaboration with Britain in secret designs against the new state. Arab "aggression" against Israel, with alleged US and British connivance, was similarly a theme of press comment. V.B. Lutskiy, in BRITISH AND AMERICAN IMPERIALISM IN THE MIDDLE EAST, published in 1948, presented the Soviet Union as the only true friend of Jewish national independence.

Few traces of this original Soviet sympathy for Israel can be found in Soviet writings today. A recent Soviet work on Israel, THE STATE OF ISRAEL, ITS SITUATION AND POLICY, by K. Ivanov and Z. Sheynis, published in 1958, places Israel among the "oppressor nations" together with the USA, Britain and France, maintains that Israel has isolated itself from the peaceloving nations of the world, and depicts the Arabs as the wronged party in the Arab-Israeli conflict.

In the light of this reversal of the Soviet attitude, it is pertinent to ask whether Soviet writers have also revised their opinion of Israel's legitimacy and viability as a state, and whether support for the Arab cause has led them to subscribe to the Arab view of Israel as an artificial creation which is doomed to eventual extinction.

Zionism The Great Soviet Encyclopaedia (1952) states:

> "The Jews do not constitute a nation since they do not represent a historically established, stable community of people which has arisen on the basis of community of language and territory, a common economic life and also a common culture. They live a common economic, political and cultural life with the peoples which surround them. For this reason ethnographically speaking the Jews have affinity (although not everywhere to the same degree) with those people among whom they live."

Ivanov and Sheynis, in their book on Israel, similarly deny the existence of a national Jewish culture. The Jewish people, they say, have during the centuries made a contribution to world culture, but have only done this "leaning on the culture of the peoples among whom they live". The same two writers also say that the contention that all persons of the Jewish faith constitute one Jewish nation is part of the philosophy of "bourgeois Zionist nationalism". Of Judaism itself the Great Soviet

Encyclopaedia says: "Like every other religion, Judaism has always been an instrument of spiritual oppression of the workers in the hands of the ruling exploiting classes."

Since they deny the concept of a Jewish nation, Soviet writers naturally regard the Zionist ideal as an absurdity. I.A. Genin, in the chapter on Israel in the ethnographic symposium THE PEOPLES OF SOUTH-WEST ASIA, gives an account of the dispersal of the Jews and remarks: "The 'return' of the Jews to Palestine, with which their ancestors severed their connection nearly 2,000 years ago, assumed in this way an artificial character."

But, more than this, Soviet writers regard Zionism as a positively dangerous doctrine since, they say, it alienates the Jewish worker from his non-Jewish fellow-workers and their class struggle against the capitalists, and falsely represents the Jewish capitalists as his friends. Ivanov and Sheynis describe Zionism as follows:

> "The Jewish workers were called on to shut themselves off from the workers of all other nationalities, to admit their 'unity of interests' with the big Jewish capitalists and financial magnates within the framework of so-called 'national-cultural autonomy', and finally to strive to come out of the dispersal (diaspora) as near as possible to Mount Zion in order to build a special Jewish state in Palestine."

But Zionism in Soviet eyes is not only a capitalist doctrine; it is also an imperialist one, since, as Ivanov and Sheynis put it, Western imperialism had "the definite political aim of setting up an outpost of colonialism in the Near East and stationing there a faithful guard over the interests of the colonizers".

In other words, since Zionism is a tool of imperialism, Israel was set up on an imperialist basis. In fact, a reviewer of the book of Ivanov and Sheynis, in PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA No.1 of 1959, says: "The State of Israel was founded not on a democratic but on an imperialist basis."

Soviet grounds for hostility Soviet hostility to Israel dates from soon after the establishment of the state in 1948. It is directed against the political complexion of Israel's Government; against Israel's foreign policy, and in particular its attitude to the Western Powers, to the USSR and to the Arab States; and against the prospects which Israel offers to would-be Jewish immigrants.

Soviet reference books present Israel's domestic policies as "anti-democratic" from the outset. They recall that in the UN voting on Palestine in 1947 the Soviet delegation voted for the formation in

Palestine of a single "bi-national democratic Arab-Jewish state"; and they go on to speak of subsequent Soviet support for separate independent "democratic" Jewish and Arab states. But, says the Great Soviet Encyclopaedia, the State of Israel as formed "was not the democratic and independent state whose formation the Soviet delegation proposed at the UN", since those who came to power in Israel were "bourgeois Jewish nationalists - Zionists" who enjoyed US and British support, and who took advantage of the Israeli-Arab war to launch a campaign against the democratic movement in Israel which was led by the Israeli Communist Party. The first elections to the Knesset, says the encyclopaedia, were held "in the circumstances of persecution of democratic elements and bribery and corruption on the part of the bourgeois parties".

On Israel's foreign policy, Ivanov and Sheynis in their book on Israel say that its rulers have set their face against neutrality; that they want Israel to be admitted to Western defence blocs, NATO, etc.; and that Israel is regarded by the USA and Britain as "a military base, a bridgehead for penetration into the Arab world, and a base for offensives against the national liberation movement in the countries of the East". On Israel's attitude to the Soviet Union, Ivanov and Sheynis say that, despite a formal undertaking by the Israeli Government not to take part in anti-Soviet military blocs, official Israeli spokesmen have stated that this would not prevent them joining any Western military blocs to which they might be admitted. On Israeli's attitude to her Arab neighbours, Ivanov and Sheynis say that "even stronger states and states with far firmer historical roots" would not have proceeded to the "amputation" of neighbours' territory which Israel effected in 1949.

But, these two Soviet writers affirm, Israel's dependence on the West is the basic cause of her "aggressive" policy. They quoted Khrushchev as saying, in an interview with a correspondent of THE TIMES published in PRAVDA of 16.2.58, that "if the big powers did not interfere the Arab countries and Israel would reach agreement more quickly by themselves".

<u>The question of immigration</u> Soviet hostility to the migration of Jews to Israel is sufficiently indicated by the fact that Soviet writers have no good word to say about conditions in Israel today. Soviet newspapers from time to time publish letters from immigrants in Israel complaining that living conditions there are intolerable, as for example a letter to Voroshilov signed by 107 Russian Jews in Israel, published in TRUD of 26.5.59. The writers explain that many of them had left the USSR for Poland after the war to look for surviving relatives, and there had been duped by "Zionist agents" into emigrating to Israel. The letter is perhaps remarkable for the accuracy with which it reproduces Soviet theses about Israel:

"The Jewish national state of Israel created with such labour was from its very first days placed at the service of imperialism by its Zionist rulers."

The letter goes on to allege that in Israel "tens of thousands of families are living in slums, cooped up in tin and plywood shacks in conditions of unbelievable overcrowding and misery". Immigrants from Eastern Europe are particularly badly treated, the writer complains:

"Honest working Jews who come from the USSR and the people's democracies are second-rate individuals in Israel. They are not trusted, and are not employed in any responsible work. It is very difficult for them to obtain permanent employment even as unskilled labourers."

The letter concludes with an appeal to Voroshilov to "allow us to return to our beloved Fatherland".

Ivanov and Sheynis, in their book on Israel, say that the reason why American, British and French Jews never try to emigrate to Israel is that Jews in the West are "in general informed about the real situation of affairs in Israel". Soviet writers on Israel use many arguments to discourage would-be emigrants to Israel; what they are careful not to refer to at all is the actual existence of a desire to emigrate among Jews in the USSR and Eastern Europe.

"Progressive" movements in Israel Remnants of Soviet sympathy with Israel can only be detected in references to what Soviet writers call "the struggle of progressive forces in Israel for democracy and the peaceful development of the country" - the Communist Party of Israel being of course regarded as the leader of these "progressive forces". The existence of such an anti-Zionist and anti-imperialist movement within Israel is presented in Soviet writings as a hopeful sign for Israel's future. I.A. Genin, in his chapter on Israel in THE PEOPLES OF SOUTH-WEST ASIA (1957), says:

"The working masses of Israel are coming out more frequently and in a more organized manner in defence of their economic and political rights, and against the policy of obedience to the dictation of imperialist states. During recent years there have been massive strikes of industrial and agricultural workers, students, teachers, doctors and civil servants. There has been a series of demonstrations by artisans, unemployed and inhabitants of immigrants' camps. Economic demands, as a rule, have been united with political ones - struggle for national independence with struggle for peace."

In Israel, Soviet writers affirm, Jewish workers are persecuted, just as it is Jewish workers who are the main victims of anti-Semitism in capitalist countries. The main expressions of Soviet sympathy, however, are reserved for Israel's Arab minority, who are represented as the victims of "national oppression".

Israel's future Soviet writers represent Israel's leaders as following a policy which is doomed to failure. P. Milov, reviewing the book on Israel by Ivanov and Sheynis in INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS No.12 of 1958, remarks:-

> "All down the years Israel has invariably followed in the wake of the Western imperialist policy, preparing for the next 'round' of war with her Arab neighbours. The Zionist leaders cannot and do not wish to see that colonialism is doomed historically... They, on the contrary, calculate to use colonialism for strengthening and expanding Israel's borders."

The future for Israel, Soviet writers say, lies in accommodation with her Arab neighbours and the pursuit of an independent foreign policy that will ensure peace and benefit the Israeli working masses. Beyond this Soviet writers do not seem to look. However, there are occasional assurances of Soviet friendship if such a course is followed. In an article entitled "Israel Letter" in NEW TIMES No.12 of 1958 "A.B." writes: "Our people say that 'as long as there is the Soviet Union in the world we can overcome any difficulties with confidence and optimism'."

However, "A.B." may be an Israeli Arab, since most of his article is about the plight of Arabs in Israel. But the theme of Soviet-Israeli friendship is sometimes touched on, as in an article by Galina Shergova in IZVESTIYA of 3.7.59. She says that a packed meeting of the Israel-Soviet friendship society which she attended during a visit to Israel proved that "not all Israelis are disposed to sing to the transatlantic tune", and relates how in a factory workers pressed around her party asking them "to take a message of greeting to our Fatherland".

Thus, although the logical conclusion of Soviet arguments about Zionism would be the denial of any raison d'etre for Israel, and although the tone of most Soviet writing about Israel is hostile, nevertheless Israel is recognized by Soviet writers as a state which, if it decided to follow a "progressive" course, might still win Soviet approval.

(Next issue: "Israel's Socialism")

THE XXVth INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS OF ORIENTALISTS - LENINGRAD 1960

The holding of the XXVth International Congress of Orientalists in Leningrad in August 1960 is evidently regarded in the Soviet Union as both a challenge and an opportunity for Soviet orientalists. It will be the first of the Congresses to be held in Russia since they started in 1873. The decision to hold this Congress in Leningrad was taken at the XXIVth Congress, held in Munich in 1957; and soon afterwards SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE (No.6 of 1957) published an editorial on the significance of the Congress for Soviet orientalists:

> "The Congress is a great and solemn event for orientalists of the whole world and will be the fulfilment of a vast creative scientific effort. Three years in which to prepare for the Congress is not a long time, and in order to ensure that it will be of a high standard much organizational, research and publishing work must be done... It is the duty of all Soviet scholars, oriental institutions and organizations to take an active part in the work, the successful completion of which will result in a further improvement in Soviet oriental studies and in their attainment to a worthy place in world orientalism."

PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA No.4 and SOVREMENNY VOSTOK No.7 of 1959 have now published articles on the preparations for the Congress. According to the former, Soviet orientalists will submit papers in all the 12 sections of the Congress, namely: (1) Egyptology; (2) Assyriology; (3) Urart studies and Hittology; (4) Semitology, biblical archaeology and Hebraica; (5) Byzantinology and allied subjects; (6) history of the Arab countries; (7) Arab philosophy; (8) history of Persia and Afghanistan; (9) Persian philology; (10) history of Central Asia; (11) Altai studies; (12) history of Turkey; (13) Caucasian studies; (14) Indology; (15) South-East Asia; (16) Sinology (with sub-sections: (a) history of China and (b) Chinese philology); (17) Korea; (18) Mongolia; (19) Japan; (20) African studies (with sub-sections: (a) history of the peoples of Africa south of the Sahara and (b) African philology).

The number of papers submitted by Soviet scholars will be about 70-80; this, PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA says, is a comparatively small number, so as to allow the maximum number of papers to the visitors, but quality should be high for that reason.

SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.6 of 1957 said that it was to the benefit of the Congress that it should be held in Leningrad, with its rich traditions of oriental studies and its many eminent orientalists, philologists particularly. Leningrad University and the Leningrad branch

of the Academy of Sciences possessed rich libraries and notable collections of oriental manuscripts, and the Hermitage Museum had outstanding collections of ancient and medieval historical documents.

Participation of Eastern scholars Oriental studies are not the sole concern of the institutes of oriental studies and sinology of the Academy of Science, PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA points out. Oriental subjects are also dealt with in other institutes of the Academy - those of history, philosophy, world literature, world economics and international relations. In addition, oriental studies are pursued in institutes or departments of oriental studies in the Uzbek, Tajik, Kazakh, Azarbaijan, Georgian and Armenian Union Republics and in university centres in all republics of the Soviet East. SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK says that there will be a wide participation in the Congress by scholars of Central Asia and Transcaucasia, "where during the years of Soviet power there has arisen a galaxy of talented researchers who by their labours have enriched Soviet and world orientalism".

SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.6 of 1957 said that it was a "very great shortcoming" of the XXIVth Congress that no scholars were present from the Chinese People's Republic, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Mongolian People's Republic, and that no official delegations were present from India, Burma and many other eastern countries. At the XXVth Congress, the journal said, it was essential to ensure a widely representative attendance from eastern countries; "today truly scientific oriental studies are impossible without taking into consideration what has been achieved in a particular field by scholars of the country concerned."

SOVREMENNY VOSTOK No.7 of 1959 now says that at the XXVth Congress representatives of eastern countries will "take part on a far wider scale", but gives no further details. It goes on:

> "This marks the beginning of what is in essence a new development in international congresses of orientalists: the researches of Western scholars will be supported and enriched by those of Eastern scholars, whose radical advantage consists in the fact that they do not simply study the particular problems of the historical activity of their peoples, but are living and immediate participants in this activity, and base their researches not only on literary sources and historical records but on the concrete reality which they are creating together with their people."

The presence for the first time of a delegation from the Chinese People's Republic, says SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK, will be "of great progressive importance".

Eastern "liberation movements" SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.6 of 1957 says that the activity of Soviet orientalists is informed by the notion that science should serve society. It says:

> "Soviet oriental studies are characterized throughout by their militant anti-colonialism, which is expressed in sharp, scientifically based criticism of the apologists of imperialism and racism; and by the spirit of true internationalism which finds expression in respect for the merits and national traditions of the peoples of the East."

The same journal also remarks that at the XXIVth Congress "the problems of the modern East and, in particular, the problem of the national liberation movement were presented only in the contributions of the scholars from socialist countries". It insists that the XXVth Congress should "reflect the very great qualitative changes (underlining in text) which are beginning to show in oriental studies with the decay of the colonial system and with the achievement of national independence by several eastern peoples".

PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA now says that the scientific public of the USSR hopes that the forthcoming Congress will, together with the achievements of Soviet studies, display their "links with life and deep sympathy with the liberation struggle of the peoples of the East". It observes:

> "Oriental studies as a humane subject cannot fail to be linked with life and with the destinies of mankind; and the most widely shared human aspirations and demands of the present era are co-existence and the demand for peace and national equality, freedom and socialism, and happiness for all working people without distinction of nationality, race or colour of skin. Orientalists must not forget the great humanistic vocation of their science - to assist by their own scientific efforts the historic world process of the liberation of the peoples of the East from the shameful colonial system, and to assist their rebirth and the promotion of their active role in deciding the destinies of the world and of human civilization."

The Marxist-Leninist line All Soviet accounts of the conduct of oriental studies in the USSR emphasize their Marxist-Leninist basis. Soviet oriental studies, says SOVREMENNYY VOSTOK, are "based on a firm foundation of Marxist-Leninist theory". SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.6 of 1957 recalled the reorganization of Soviet oriental studies which took place in the 1930s, which was characterized by "retreat from the ideas of bourgeois orientalism, the assimilation of Marxist-Leninist methodology and the application of the theories of Marxism-Leninism to the study and solution of concrete oriental problems".

In this connection "bourgeois" oriental scholarship is equated by Soviet writers with what PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA calls "the old orientalism", which, the journal says, is particularly characterized by "formal philological studies"; Marxist-Leninist orientalism, on the other hand, is represented as modern in outlook and as probing deeply and scientifically into the "social-economic processes" which underly the phenomena being studied. SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.6 of 1957 observed:

> "By relating their researches to the present, orientalists studying the ancient and medieval history of the East are able to distinguish the most important national traditions of a given people, to study the roots of those social institutions which have lasted until today, and to determine what today is a survival from the distant past and hinders progress and what is progressive, truly popular and worthy of support and future development."

The theses of Lenin, says PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA, are for the orientalist an "Ariadne's thread" enabling him to find his way in "the labyrinth of contradictory facts and phenomena" and to distinguish between the reactionary and the progressive among contemporary developments in the eastern countries.

But Soviet orientalists are not only guided by the permanent propositions and tenets of Marxism-Leninism; they are also subject to the ad hoc directives issued by the periodical Congresses of the Soviet Communist Party. SOVETSKOYE VOSTOKOVEDENIYE No.6 of 1957 recalled that the XXth CPSE Congress criticized Soviet orientalists for "major shortcomings", namely "dogmatism" and "insufficient attention to present-day problems".

PROBLEMY VOSTOKOVEDENIYA is assertive about the superiority which it claims for Marxist-Leninist methods; and it also affirms that this superiority will be demonstrated at the forthcoming Congress, at which the Soviet contributions must "prove the force of progressive ideology and of the dialectical method of research". Nevertheless, the journal says, Soviet scholars are very far from claiming that Marxism has a solution to every problem; Lenin himself ridiculed this idea as absurd; and therefore, for Western scholars who still view Soviet Marxism in this light, the exchange of ideas with Soviet scholars will be particularly valuable.

(Note: See also "Preparations for the XXVth International Congress of Orientalists", in CENTRAL ASIAN REVIEW No.2 of 1958, published by this Centre, and "New Party Tasks for Soviet Orientalists", in MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.5, pp. 10-12.)

SOVIET ANGLE ON THE NEWS

Below are reviewed Soviet newspaper reports on Middle East events published during the period 1st August - 21st September

The Iraqi Communist Party The Iraqi Communist Party's account of shortcomings in its policy, which was published in the Iraqi Communist organ ITTIHAD ASH-SHA'B on 3rd August, was published in full in the Soviet Communist Party journal KOMMUNIST No.12 of 1959, and a shortened version appeared in PRAVDA of 17th August. According to this account, the Iraqi Communist Party's demand for participation in the Government, although "correct in substance", had been wrongly presented to the masses and had impaired relations with the national authorities; the Party's policy had been "at times under the influence of day-to-day events and the spontaneous movement of the masses"; there had been cases of "extreme measures" such as punitive actions, purges, tortures and other violations of Party principles; "leftist political errors" had been committed; and the principle of collective leadership had given way to individual leadership. Among corrective measures to be taken would be "a gradual purge of opportunist, extremist and undisciplined elements from the Party".

Soviet-Iraqi technical cooperation An agreement on Soviet-Iraqi co-operation in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes was signed in Moscow on 17th August, according to PRAVDA. The agreement provides for Soviet technical cooperation in the building of an atomic reactor for research purposes, an isotope laboratory, geological prospecting for radio-active ores, the organization of work in research institutes and institutes of higher education, and the training of Iraqi specialists in the use of atomic energy for peaceful purposes.

Soviet newspapers reported that on 6th August new broadcasting studios built with Soviet assistance were opened in Baghdad, in the presence of Qasim and members of the Iraqi Government.

PRAVDA of 13th August reported that, under the Soviet-Iraqi economic and technical aid agreement, an agreement had been signed in Baghdad for Soviet assistance in the construction of a works for the repair and construction of river vessels in Basrah.

The Aswan High Dam On 2nd August PRAVDA published an article (about 3,000 words) on the Aswan High Dam project by N. Malyshev, Hero of Socialist Labour and chief engineer of the project. Malyshev explained the problems of regulation of the Nile flow, set forth the aims of the High Dam scheme, and gave an account of the project for the dam drawn up

by Sir Alexander Gibb and Partners. He then pointed out shortcomings in the latter project, and outlined (with a diagram) the modifications to the project made by the Soviet engineers, which would shorten the period of construction and reduce the cost.

Soviet aid in Syrian irrigation project Under the Soviet-Syrian agreement of 28th October 1957 an agreement was signed in Damascus on 27th August for exploratory work on a project for the irrigation from the Euphrates of 100,000 hectares of new land, according to IZVESTIYA of 29th August. The agreement envisages the construction of the biggest hydro-engineering complex in the Arab East, and also the construction of three main canals of a total length of over 200 km.

Soviet oil discovery in Syria TRUD of 6th August reported that Soviet experts had discovered large oil deposits in the Karachuk district of the Syrian region of the UAR. The Syrian AL-AYYAM, said TRUD, had published a leading article on this, which claimed that the oil found would not only provide enough for Syria's needs but would even allow for exports. Western oil companies, said AL-AYYAM, had maintained that there was no oil in the area.

Anti-communism in the UAR PRAVDA of 20th August published a report on the opening in Alexandria of the trial of 64 UAR citizens accused of belonging to the Communist Party of Egypt and of attempting to overthrow the present regime of the country. PRAVDA noted that among the accused were workers, servicemen, students, journalists and what it called "representatives of the progressive-minded national intelligentsia". It noted that "in journalistic circles in Cairo attention is drawn to the connection between the present trial and the anti-communist campaign being waged by reactionary circles in the UAR".

Soviet newspapers published many reports of protests against the UAR authorities' action in arresting the Lebanese Communist Party leader Farajallah Hilu when he was in Damascus on 25th June (see MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.8, p.13). The protests have now assumed the proportions of a campaign.

TRUD of 1st August reported that the UAR Foreign Ministry had refused a request by the US Embassy in Cairo for the showing of anti-communist American films in UAR cinemas.

Trial of communists in the Sudan Soviet newspapers on 27th August reported without comment the forthcoming trial of 10 members of the Sudanese Communist Party, including its secretary Abd al-Khaliq Mahjub.

Soviet-Lebanese relations The 15th anniversary of the establishment of diplomatic relations between the USSR and Lebanon was the subject of an exchange of complimentary messages between Khrushchev and the Lebanese Premier Rashid Karame, reported in Soviet newspapers on 15th August. On 5th August PRAVDA published an article by Medvedev on the Soviet Union's friendship and support for the Lebanese Republic and people.

Persia Articles in PRAVDA and IZVESTIYA denounced the US-Persian military agreement and drew a grim picture of its effect on the economic and political situation in Persia. Mayevskiy, in a PRAVDA article on 26th August entitled "Independence sold", said that US military bases in Persia were to be supplemented by nine more in Marand, Kushi(?), Ajabshahr, Chehel-Dokhtar, Zirab, Rahna (?), Nowdeh, Dizful and Tehran. These bases, said Mayevskiy, were not being built in the interests of Persia's people, but on the contrary placed a huge financial burden on them and were a serious threat to Persia's security. The fact was that the Shah was afraid of his people, and had sold his country's independence for the support of American bayonets.

In an IZVESTIYA article on the same theme on 2nd September A. Yermolayev said that it must be plain to all but the most naive that, if aggression were launched from Persian territory on US orders, crushing nuclear blows at military objectives all over Persia were bound to follow.

The above two articles, despite their denunciation of Persian policy, were noticeably less violent in their language than articles published earlier in the Soviet campaign against Persia (cf. "A throne based on terror", MIZAN NEWSLETTER No.7, p.10).

Issued by Central Asian Research Centre
in association with
St. Anthony's College (Oxford) Soviet Affairs Study Group